# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

### CHARLESTON DI VISION

IN RE: AMERICAN MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC., MDL NO. 2325 IN RE: BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORP., MDL NO. 2326

IN RE: ETHICON, INC., MDL NO. 2327

PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE HELD ON APRIL 13, 2012 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. GOODWIN, CHIEF JUDGE AND THE HONORABLE MARY E. STANLEY, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Court Reporter: Teresa L. Harvey, RMR, RDR, CRR

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer.

# Plaintiffs' Counsel:

Erin Copeland FIBICH HAMPTON LEEBRON BRIGGS & JOSEPHSON 1150 Bissonnet St. Houston, TX 77005

Julie B. Isen
Pete Miller
The Miller Firm
108 Railroad Ave.
Orange, VA 22960

Carl N. Frankovitch
FRANKOVITCH, ANETAKIS, COLANTONIO & SIMON
337 Penco Road
Weirton, WV 26062

Gary B. Blasingame
Henry G. Garrard, III
Josh B. Wages
James B. Matthews
BLASINGAME, BURCH, GARRARD & ASHLEY
P. O. Box 832
Athens, GA 30603

Bryan F. Aylstock
D. Renee Baggett
Neil D. Overholtz
Douglass Alan Kreis
AYLSTOCK, WITKIN, KREIS & OVERHOLTZ
17 E. Main, St., Suite 200
Pensacola, FL 32502

David Lee Augustus THE SPENCER LAW FIRM 4635 Southwest Freeway, Ste. 900 Houston, TX 77027

Martin Daniel Crump **DAVIS & CRUMP** 1712 15<sup>th</sup> Place, Third Floor Gulfport, MS 39501

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Aubrey Le (Appearing for Lisa Blue) 2049 Century Park East, Ste. 1940 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Taheena Thompson
COHEN & MALLAD
One Indiana Square, Ste. 1400
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Mark R. Mueller Andres Pereira Breanne M. Vandermeer **MUELLER LAW** 404 West 7<sup>th</sup> St. Austin, TX 78701

Shi reen Mohsenzadegan Paul D. Stevens MILSTEIN ADELMAN 2800 Donald Douglas Loop North Santa Monica, CA 90405

Karen H. Beyea-Schroeder Laura Yaeger Robert Bench David Hobbs FLEMING NOLEN JEZ 2800 Post Oak Blvd., Ste. 4000 Houston, TX 77056

Andrew J. Geiger
ALLAN BERGER & ASSOCIATES
4173 Canal St.
New Orleans, LA 70119

Victoria Maniatis SANDERS VIENER GROSSMAN 100 Herricks Road Mineola, NY 11501

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Jim M. Perdue, Jr. PERDUE KIDD VICKERY 510 Bering Dr., Ste. 550 Houston, TX 77057

Di anne M. Nast **RODANAST** 801 Estelle Drive Lancaster, PA 17601

Alyson Oliver KRESCH OLIVER 24100 Southfield Rd., Ste. 305 Southfield, MI 48075

Jonathan D. Orent MOTLEY RICE 321 S. Main St., Second Floor Providence, RI 02903

Joseph A. Osborne BABBITT, JOHNSON, OSBORNE & LE CLAINCHE 1641 Worthington Road, Ste. 100 West Palm Beach, FL 33409

P. Leigh O'Dell BEASLEY, ALLEN, CROW, METHVIN, PORTIS & MILES P. O. Box 4160 Montgomery, AL 36103-4160

Michelle A. Parfitt ASHCRAFT & GEREL 2000 L St., Ste. 400 Washington, DC 20036

Jerrold S. Parker PARKER WAICHMAN ALONSO 111 Great Neck Road Great Neck, NY 11021-5042

Bryan A. Pfleeger
MICHAEL HINGLE & ASSOCIATES
P. O. Box 1129
Slidell, LA 70459

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Stephen D. Phillips PHILLIPS LAW OFFICES 161 North Clark St., Ste. 4925 Chicago, IL 60601

Christopher M. Placitella COHEN, PLACITELLA & ROTH 127 Maple Avenue Red Bank, NJ 07701

Jacob Plattenberger TOR HOERMAN LAW 101 West Vandalia, Ste. 350 Edwardsville, IL 62025

Derek H. Potts THE POTTS LAW FIRM 908 Broadway, Third Floor Kansas City, MO 64105

Robert E. Price LEVIN, PAPANTONIO, THOMAS, MITCHELL, RAFFERTY & PROCTOR 316 South Baylen Street, Ste. 400 Pensacola, FL 32502

John M. Restaino THE RESTAINO LAW FIRM 1550 Larimer St., #527 Denver, CO 80202

Julie L. Rhoades MATTHEWS & ASSOCIATES 2905 Sackett Street Houston, TX 77098

Bill Robins, III HEARD ROBINS CLOUD & BLACK 300 Paseo de Peralta, Ste. 200 Santa Fe, NM 87501

Amanda Robinson **ROBINSON CALCAGNIE ROBINSON SHAPIRO DAVIS** 19 Corporate Plaza Drive Newport Beach, CA 92660

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Karen Barth Menzies **ROBINSON, CALCAGNIE & ROBINSON** 620 Newport Center Dr., Ste. 700 Newport Beach, CA 92660

Beth S. Rose SILLS, CUMMIS & GROSS One Riverfront Plaza Newark, NJ 07102

Robert L. Salim
P. Ann Trantham
LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT L. SALIM
1901 Texas Street
Natchitoches, LA 71457

Laurel Simes Rachel Beth Abrams **LEVIN SIMES** 353 Sacramento St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

Fred Thompson, III Donald A. Migliori MOTLEY RICE P. O. Box 1792 Mount Pleasant, SC 29465

Tim K. Goss John P. Harloe, III FREESE & GOSS 3031 Allen St., Ste. 200 Dallas, TX 75204

Dori A. Milner
NAPOLI BERN RIPKA SHKOLNIK
Empire State Building
350 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10118

Andrew J. Cross CAREY DANIS & LOWE 8235 Forsyth Blvd., Ste. 1100 St. Louis, MO 63105

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Rachel Beth Abrams **LEVIN SIMES** 353 Sacramento St., 20th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

C. Todd Alley
ALLEY CLARK & GREIWE
P. O. Box 3127
Tampa, FL 33601

Thomas R. Anapol ANAPOL SCHWARTZ 1710 Spruce St. Philadelphia, PA 19103

Benjamin H. Anderson ANDERSON LAW OFFICES 1360 West 9th St., Ste. 200 Cleveland, OH 44113

Ri chard J. Arsenaul t NEBLETT BEARD & ARSENAULT 2220 Bonaventure Court Al exandria, LA 71301

Lee B. Balefsky KLINE & SPECTER 1525 Locust St. 19th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

Harry F. Bell, Jr. **THE BELL LAW FIRM**P. O. Box 1723 Charleston, WV 25326

Derriel C. McCorvey

The Law Office of Derriel C. McCorvey

115 W. Main St., Ste. 14

Lafayette, LA 70502

Aimee H. Wagstaff ANDRUS HOOD & WAGSTAFF 1999 Broadway, Ste. 4150 Denver, CO 80202

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

C. Michael Bollinger NEBLETT, BEARD & ARSENAULT P. O. Box 1190 Alexandria, LA 71301

Shelley V. Hutson HUTSON LAW FIRM 440 Louisiana St., Suite 1600 Houston, TX 77002

Koren L. Cohen MORELLI RATNER 950 Third Ave. New York, NY 10022

A. Donald C. Discepolo
DISCEPOLO, LLP
111 S. Calvert St., Suite 1950
Baltimore, MD 21202

C. F. Jeb Wait, M.D., J.D. WAIT & ASSOCIATES
205 Swede Creek
Boerne, TX 78006

Daniel Leathers **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN** 250 Hudson St., 8<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10013-1413

Paul J. Hanly, Jr. Jayne Conroy HANLY, CONROY, BIERSTEIN, SHERIDAN, FISHER & HAYES 112 Madi son Avenue New York, NY 10016-7416

Joseph H. Saunders SAUNDERS & WALKER 3491 Gandy Bl vd. N, Ste. 200 Pinellas Park, FL 33781

<u>Plaintiffs' Counsel:</u> (continues)

Adam M. Evans THE HOLLIS LAW FIRM 5100 West 9<sup>th</sup> Street Prairie Village, KS 66207

A. J. De Bartolomeo GIRARD GIBBS 601 California St., 14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108

Ed Blizzard BLIZZARD, McCARTHY & NABERS 440 Louisiana Street Houston, TX 77002

Lee B. Balefsky Lisa Dagostino Mark A. Hoffman KLINE & SPECTER 1525 Locust St., 19<sup>th</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

Margaret Thompson, MD, JD MUELLER LAW 404 W. 7th Street Austin, TX 78701

Mallory J. Mangold TAYLOR MARTINO 51 Saint Joseph St. Mobile, AL 36602

Adam Pulaski **PULASKI & MIDDLEMAN** 4615 Southwest Fwy, Ste. 850 Houston, TX 77027

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

David Matthews MATTHEWS & ASSOCIATES 3905 Sackett Street Houston, TX 77098

James M. Gallagher

JAMES MICHAEL GALLAGHER & ASSOCIATES
8100 Penn Avenue, South, Ste. 117
Minneapolis, MN 55431

Chris W. Cantrell **DOYLE LOWTHER** 10200 WillowCreek Rd., Ste. 150 San Diego, CA 92131

Mi chael H. Bowman WEXLER WALLACE 55 W. Monroe St., Ste 3300 Chi cago, IL 60603

Amy Erskin Mark E. Burton, Jr. HERSH & HERSH 601 Van Ness Ave., Ste. 2080 San Franciso, CA 94102

Thomas P. Cartmell WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL 4740 Grand Ave., Ste. 300 Kansas City, MO 64112

Eric T. Chaffin CHAFFIN LUHANA 600 Third Ave., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10016

Clayton A. Clark Scott A. Love Michael W. Moreland CLARK, LOVE & HUTSON 440 Louisiana St., Ste 1600 Houston, TX 77002

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Kevin J. Davidson **ZEVAN & DAVIDSON** 1 North Taylor Ave. St. Louis, MO 63108

Kevin Edwards Peter de la Cerda EDWARDS & DE LA CERDA 3031 Allen St., Ste. 100 Dallas, TX 75204

Steve M. Faries KABATEC BROWN KELLNER 644 S. Figueroa St. Los Angeles, CA 90017

Paul T. Farrell, Jr. GREENE, KETCHUM, BAILEY, WALKER, FARRELL & TWEEL P. O. Box 2389 Huntington, WV 25724-2389

Yvonne M. Flaherty LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN 100 Washington Ave., S, Ste. 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55401

Peter J. Flowers FOOTE MEYERS MIELKE & FLOWERS 3 North Second St., Ste. 300 St. Charles, IL 60174

Eric H. Gibbs GIRARD GIBBS 601 California St., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94108

Michael Goetz MORGAN & MORGAN 201 N. Franklin St., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Tampa, FL 33602

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

James Francis Green ASHCRAFT & GEREL 2000 L. Street, NW, Ste. 400 Washington, DC 20036

W. Todd Harvey BURKE HARVEY & FRANKOWSKI 2151 Highland Ave., Ste. 120 Birmingham, AL 35205

Stacy K. Hauer JOHNSON BECKER 33 S. Sixth St., Ste. 4530 Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123

Andrea Solomon Hirsch HERMAN GEREL 230 Peachtree St., Ste. 2260 Atlanta, GA 30303

Patrick Hillary Hufft HUFFT & HUFFT 635 St. Charles Ave. New Orleans, LA 70130

Anthony D. Irpino IRPINO LAW FIRM 2216 Magazine St. New Orleans, LA 70130

David Kuttles Richard D. Meadow THE LANIER LAW FIRM 126 East 56th St., Sixth Floor New York, NY 10022

Chad A. McGowan McGOWAN, HOOD & FELDER 1539 Health Care Dr. Rock Hill, SC 29732

Plaintiffs' Counsel: (continues)

Candice Lynn McNabb THE POTTS LAW FIRM 4615 Southwest Freeway, Ste. 850 Houston, TX 77027

Trent B. Miracle
SIMMONS BROWDER GIANARIS ANGELIDES & BARNERD
One Court Street
Alton, IL 62002

Douglas C. Monsour THE MONSOUR LAW FIRM P. O. Box 4209 Longview, TX 75606

Willard J. Moody, Jr. THE MOODY LAW FIRM P. O. Box 1138 Portsmouth, VA 23705

David E. Tuszynski GARLAND, SAMUEL & LOEB 3151 Maple Drive, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30305-2500

Edward A. Wallace WEXLER TORISEVA WALLACE 55 Monroe St., Ste. 3300 Chicago, IL 60603

Kimberly R. Wilson **LEWIS & ROBERTS** P. O. Box 17529 Raleigh, NC 27619

O. Mark Zamora MARK ZAMORA ATTORNEYS P. O. Box 660216 Atlanta, GA 30366

Joseph J. Zonies **REILLY POZNER** 1900 16<sup>th</sup> St., Ste. 1700 Denver, CO 8020

<u>Plaintiffs' Counsel:</u> (continues)

C. Anthony Graffeo WATSON GRAFFEO P. O. Box 467 Huntsville, AL 35804

## DEFENSE COUNSEL:

S. DeAnn Bomar SWIFT, CURRIE, McGHEE & HIERS 1355 Peachtree St. NE, Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30309

Melissa Foster Bird NELSON, MULLINS, RILEY & SCARBOROUGH 949 Third Ave., Suite 200 Huntington, WV 25701

Ressie L. Ragland
PATTON, TIDWELL & SCHROEDER
P. O. Box 5398
Texarkana, TX 75505-5398

Carrie R. Guest MARTIN & JONES 410 Glenwood Ave., Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27603

Robert T. Adams Jon A. Strongman SHOOK, HARDY & BACON 2555 Grand Bl vd. Kansas Ci ty, MO 64108-2613

Ronn B. Kreps
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI
2100 IDS Center
80 South Eighth St.
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2112

**Defense Counsel**: (continues)

William M. Gage BUTLER, SNOW, O'MARA, STEVENS & CANNADA 1020 Highland Colony Parkway, Ste. 1400 Ridgeland, MS 39157

Barbara R. Binis Tracy G. Weiss REED SMITH LLP 2500 One Liberty Place 1650 Market Street Philadelphia. P A 19103

David B. Thomas
Philip J. Combs
Sarah L. Martin
GUTHRIE & THOMAS
P. O. Box 3394
Charleston, WV 25333-3394

Michael Farrell FARRELL, WHITE & LEGG PLLC P.O. Box 647 Huntington, WV 25772

Mi chael Bonasso Elizabeth Taylor FLAHERTY, SENSABAUGH & BONASSO P. O. Box 3843 Charleston, WV 25338-3843

Deborah A. Moeller Bryan Pratt Matthew D. Keenan SHOOK, HARDY & BACON 2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108

Daniel Leathers **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN** 250 Hudson St., 8<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10013-1413

<u>Defense Counsel:</u> (continues)

Kelly S. Crawford **RIKER DANZIG SCHERER HYLAND & PERRETTI** P. O. Box 1981 Morristown, NJ 07962-1981

Richard B. North, Jr. NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH 201 17<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Ste. 1700 Atlanta, GA 30363

Erik W. Legg FARRELL, FARRELL & FARRELL P. O. Box 6457 Huntington, WV 25772-6457

David B. Thomas **GUTHRIE & THOMAS** P. O. Box 3394 Charleston, WV 25333-3394 PROCEEDINGS had before Chief Judge Joseph R. Goodwin and Magistrate Judge Mary E. Stanley, United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, in Charleston, West Virginia, on April 13, 2012:

THE COURT: Good morning.

is In re American Medical Systems, Inc., MDL 2325; In re Boston Scientific Corp., MDL 2326; and In re: Ethicon, Inc., MDL 2327, Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Good morning. I'm

Judge Goodwin. Joining me on the bench is Judge Mary Stanley.

This is quite a group. Impressive. Intimidating. Wealthy.

Let me -- come use the jury box for places to sit. Any chairs you can find you're welcome to use. There are chairs over there behind that table as well.

Let me introduce the law clerks: My law clerk, Angie Volk, and Judge Stanley's law clerk, Kate Fife. You'll find that our staff, law clerks, and the people who work in the clerk's office are friendly and helpful. I hope you've already found that out, if you've had occasion to deal with them. If you have occasion to complain, let me know.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Charleston economy.

The bartenders at the Embassy Suites and the Marriott are grateful.

I'm sure that most of you have done your homework and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gotten the book on me, and some of you have heard these remarks at least once before, and sometimes twice. For those who have not, let me give you my side of it. I graduated from law school in 1970. I tried lawsuits for 25 years, and that was back when trial lawyers tried lawsuits. I tried dog bite -for those of you who are joining us on the phone, be sure you put your phones on mute. As I started to say, I tried dog bites, drunk driving, murder cases, many car wrecks, products cases, securities cases, commercial cases, and to my everlasting regret, a few boundary disputes. Now, I'm here to tell you that I loved most of those years in the practice of law, but quite candidly, by 1995, some 17 years ago, I was growing tired of some of the trends in the practice of law. was becoming exasperated with unpredictable schedules and an increasing deficit of common courtesy among members of the bar - even common decency. I'd begun to yearn for those long-ago days of handshake settlements, agreed-upon schedules, and just plain good humor. I'm sure deposition rooms filled with choking smoke and road trips where opposing counsel met for too many drinks and high fat dinners would not appeal to all of you, but we had a good time and I'd come to miss them. This is not just nostalgia. I was actually revolted -- I hear someone on the phone that needs to turn their phone on mute because I can hear the chatter in the background. revolted by the rise of -- I'm going to turn the phone off if

```
1
   we can't make sure that your phones are on mute. I still hear
2
    somebody saying, "We have also. . . "
 3
         (Laughter in courtroom.)
              CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: All right. It seems to have
4
5
    qui eted down.
6
              MAGISTRATE JUDGE STANLEY:
                                         No.
7
              UNI DENTI FI ED TELEPHONI C SPEAKER:
                                                Ma'am, I'm not sure
   if you realize, but you're dictating into the phone conference.
8
9
              UNI DENTI FI ED FEMALE TELEPHONI C SPEAKER: Oh, my gosh.
10
    Is that not on mute? I'm so sorry. (Laughter in courtroom.)
11
              CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: The culprit has been
12
   identified, but not by name. (Laughter.)
13
              CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: All right. I got to the point
14
   where I didn't want to open another letter from opposing
15
    counsel misconstruing a telephone conversation deliberately
16
    that we'd had the day before and sending a copy to the judge
17
    for their education. I dreaded the next time some lawyer was
18
    going to question my integrity in a statement to the court,
19
    usually in writing. Rarely did anybody have the guts to do it
20
    in person. So when Senator Byrd came to see me and suggested
21
    he might persuade the President to give me this job, it took me
22
    very little time to warm to the idea. Don't get me wrong, I
23
    love the law. I believed then -- I believed then as I do now
24
    that lawyers are the best company in the world. But this job
25
    seemed like a good idea 17 years ago, and it's proved to be
```

over those 17 years. I think it's the best job in the world. This introduction is only by way of explaining to you that you will find in this little corner - it's not so little today; it's pretty big -- corner of the legal world civility and good humor are not only encouraged, but they are required.

(Tel ephone background noi se. )

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Please put -- please put your -- it sounds like somebody was blowing their horn. Please put your phone on mute.

Let's just put it this way: I don't put up with meanness. I don't put up with meanness. I treasure a good legal argument. It's a lot of fun. But I have high hopes that you have no occasion to learn how low my tolerance is for petty By its nature, this litigation is complicated, it's di sputes. difficult, and because of its size, it will make everybody's life a lot easier if we adopt a common commitment to courtesy and the highest professional standards. I expect both. I know you will pledge yourselves to cooperation and civility.

I have two more expectations. I almost want you to take notes on this because, believe it or not, it has become common for lawyers not to read the orders or not to read the rules. - 1 expect you to invariably read carefully and follow the Civil Rules of Procedure, our local rules, and our orders. are not suggestions. Failure to comply with a court order is a violation of law. I would say -- and I'll let Judge Stanley, when we get to her part here in a little bit, tell you what

percentage of the discovery disputes could be resolved by simply picking up the rule book and reading the rule.

All right. Three separate agendas for this meeting were submitted to the Court. I've combined the common issues into one agenda and have included issues raised by individual defendants or the plaintiffs in these cases as additional agenda items as necessary. I will give counsel and each of you adequate time as we move through the agenda and at the end of this hearing to discuss any matters that I miss or you feel need to be brought to my attention.

The first item on the agenda is the introduction of counsel. Some of you I'm familiar with; most of you I don't know. I look forward to getting to know you. For those of you who have taken the time in accordance with Pretrial Order No. 1 to appear for this hearing, either individually or as a representative of parties with similar interests, your appearance will be noted. I think there was a sign-up out front and that will be entered with the clerk as an appearance in the case. All of the names from the sign-in sheets that were available out there will be given to the court reporter. If you did not have a chance to sign in prior to the beginning of the hearing, please see my law clerk, Angie Volk, after the hearing and your name will be added.

After I select lead counsel I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves. Some counsel for the plaintiffs

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

submitted to the Court a proposed counsel organizational structure. It is my information that the proposal for that structure and the people proposed enjoys a broad consensus among the plaintiffs' lawyers across the country that participated in the efforts to organize, for want of a better word, this litigation. Each of the attorneys on the proposed slate - that's what we call it in West Virginia, a slate except one submitted an individual application, in accordance with procedures outlined in Pretrial Orders No. 1 and No. 2. There were also applications by eight other individuals not included on the proposed slate. No objections were received by the Court as to the appointment of any person who applied. have reviewed the proposed slate of attorneys, the applications submitted, the memorandum in support, looked at the individual applications, and I find it to be in the best interests of the litigation to appoint the attorneys recommended as the slate submitted to the Court, except for the one that didn't submit an application.

A coordinated and unified plaintiffs' leadership team that spans the four related pelvic repair mesh MDLs before this Court is essential to the efficient, effective prosecution and defense of this case. The names of the individuals appointed to the rather large PSC will be forthcoming in a pretrial order. Got your pencils? Coordinating co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs will be Bryan Aylstock, Henry Garrard and Fred

Thompson. The Plaintiffs' Executive Committee will be made up of these three lawyers, as well as Tom Cartmell, Clayton Clark, Amy Eskin, Derek Potts, and Aimee Wagstaff. Mr. Garrard will continue as lead counsel in the Bard MDL and Derek Potts will join him as co-lead counsel in that group of cases. Amy Eskin and Fidelma Fitzpatrick will be co-lead counsel in MDL 2325; Clayton Clark and Aimee Wagstaff will be co-lead counsel in MDL 2326; and Renee Baggett and Tom Cartmell will be co-lead counsel in MDL 2327.

From this point forward it is my present intention to deal essentially through the coordinating co-lead counsel. I will hold them and the rest of the Executive Committee responsible for coordinating the efforts of the members of the PSC.

Plaintiffs' counsels, some of the group, have jointly recommended the following people as co-liaison counsel:
Harry Bell, Paul Farrell and Carl Frankovitch. All of these individuals submitted the required applications. Based on my experience and my review of their applications, I accept the recommendation and appoint those three as co-liaison counsel for the plaintiffs. Normally I would have one person I could go to as liaison counsel, but this is a pretty good-sized group to liaison with, so I think I'll always be able to get my hands on one of those three and they will be able, theoretically, to get their hands on all of you.

Barbara Binis of Reed Smith was recommended as lead

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counsel for defendant American Medical Systems in MDL 2325. Having read the requested application, I appoint her as lead defense counsel in MDL 2325.

Mr. Robert Adams of Shook, Hardy & Bacon was recommended as lead counsel for the defendant Boston Scientific in MDL 2326. Having read and reviewed the requested application materials, Mr. Adams is hereby appointed as lead defense counsel in MDL 2326.

Ms. Christy Jones of Butler Snow was recommended as lead counsel for defendants Ethicon and Johnson & Johnson in MDL 2327. It is my understanding that she could not be present today because she is actually in trial in front of Judge Higbee in New Jersey. I had that verified by my law clerk calling to be sure that that was in fact the case. She notified the Court of this conflict. Her partner, Mr. William Gage, is present on her behalf. Having read the requested application materials, Ms. Jones is appointed as lead defense counsel in MDL 2327. would note that actually being in trial or in intensive care are the only good excuses for lead counsel to fail to appear.

Recommendations were also received by defense counsel for the position of defendants' liaison counsel. Boston Scientific recommended Michael Bonasso of the law firm of Flaherty, Sensabaugh & Bonasso. Ethicon recommended Mr. David Thomas of the local firm of Guthrie & Thomas, and American Medical

System -- Systems recommended Mr. Michael Farrell of Farrell,

appointed. I accept my own proposal, and they are.

White & Legg. The Court received no other nominations.

Mr. Marc Williams of Nelson Mullins was previously appointed as

liaison counsel in the Bard MDL and he will continue in that role. I propose these three gentlemen as nominated be

Although an organized counsel structure is now in place, I want to emphasize that all lawyers representing plaintiffs in this litigation, regardless of their role or lack thereof in the management structure, and regardless of my designation of lawyers as lead counsel, members of the executive committee, liaison counsel, et cetera, or members of the PSC, the individual lawyers continue to bear full responsibility to represent their individual client or clients. It seems like an unnecessary reminder, but I've had enough MDL experience to know that it's worth a reminder.

The third and fourth items on the agenda include an overview of the separate MDL litigations, including the products of each defendant, the federal cases in current MDL transfer status, the court coordinated proceedings for each in state courts, the discovery pending to date, and pending motions. I have received and reviewed the requested position statements and multiple attachments received from each of the defendants, as well as the plaintiffs. I feel I have enough information on the status of those matters at this time.

Judge Stanley is going to be asking you for much more

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information at a later time, and as we'll discuss in a few minutes, we'll have another meeting before long with counsel. I did note the coordinated proceedings of state cases involving Ethicon and American Medical Systems in New Jersey before Judge Higbee, as well as the centralization of Boston Scientific cases in Massachusetts before Judge Kottmyer. have already communicated with Judge Higbee about the possibility of coordinating the MDLs with the state litigation. She's open to doing so and I think that will be a process that I will, but have not yet, made similar efforts with devel ops. Judge Kottmyer and other state court judges with consolidated And if I can, I'll even find the individual state cases cases. out there where there is no coordination in trial to get the state judges involved in a cooperative endeavor.

Let me say to you that my experience with state judges has been a very good one. No matter what the Judicial Conference of the United States posts on its website, the truth is state judges are much busier than we are and they have proved to be very -- and they have limited resources. Sometimes they don't have travel budgets. They can't -- they're not as flexible in what they can do. So we will work with the individual state judges in coordinated cases, and to the extent possible, the others to make the entire process efficient. It is much too early to decide what efficiencies can be gained through the cooperation with the state cases. As all of you as experienced

MDL lawyers and plaintiffs' lawyers and defense lawyers know, it has not been uncommon in some of the MDLs to have *Daubert* hearings conducted with a state judge on the bench and a federal judge. They reach separate decisions, maybe opposite decisions, but it's only one day, or two days, or whatever it takes, and only happens once. We're going to try to cut down on duplicative proceedings to the extent that it's possible and can be done without interfering with every party's legitimate gripe to pursue their claims in the forum of their choice.

The fifth and sixth agenda items included a number of procedural and discovery issues. While Judge Stanley will address certain discovery issues with counsel in a few minutes, a number of these items I expect that counsel for the parties will confer upon now that I have determined a counsel structure. While they are important foundational issues, it simply doesn't make sense at this point to address them individually in the context of today's hearing. It's my hope to resolve and have proposals pertaining to these issues from counsel by the time we have our next status conference. That would include a proposed order, hopefully an agreed proposed order, to cover the following topics:

Master complaints, short form complaints, and defendants' answers thereto, factsheets, preliminary motions, production of documents, medical records, privilege log protocols, protective orders, preservation of evidence, redaction protocols, ESI

protocols, amendments of proceedings, issues as to the proper party defendant, and service of process issues.

I'm going to ask Angie to post those on the website, as I notice some of you just gave up in the middle and decided you couldn't possibly get them all written down.

One item that the parties have exchanged ideas on and are specifically working on is a proposed order for the Court on the issue of direct filing of additional actions, and that's happening every day. While venue is not proper, certain plaintiffs have been and will continue to file cases directly into these MDLs or into this district. In an effort to simplify the process for filing cases, while preserving all rights and defenses which the parties might otherwise possess, the Court is ready, willing and may be able to entertain a direct filing order. I will simply ask does counsel have a proposed order for the Court on that yet?

MR. GARRARD: Your Honor, we have exchanged ideas; we have exchanged some orders. We have not come to a consensus yet. We hope we will be able to do so within the next week or so. We are all diligently working at it with some converging ideas, but I think we all have the same purpose, and we will get it to the Court.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: All right. Is that correct,
Mr. Thomas?

MR. GAGE: Yes, sir. William Gage. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N: All right. The seventh general item on the agenda is a scheduling status conference. We have held the status conference in the Bard MDL -- have held those about every 45 to 60 days, depending on what is going on. schedule has worked well thus far. The complications ensuing from having four MDLs may require more frequent meetings. won't know that until we get into this. I would like to have a status conference with coordinating co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs and defendants' lead counsel in all four cases in one month to follow up on the issues that I've raised with you today, the ones we've postponed that you suggested for today. Any attorney representing any party, or any unrepresented party, may attend any status conference, of course, but only the -- I forget what it's called now, the lead counsel -co-lead --

LAW CLERK VOLK: Coordinating.

and the lead counsel for the defendants, and liaison counsel may actively participate in the conference. Lead counsel is expected to attend each status conference in person. My law clerk will communicate with you concerning proposed dates and times. Judge Stanley and I have tried, with considerable success in the past, to accommodate the schedules of counsel to the extent possible, but surprisingly, this is sometimes difficult to do, but we'll do our best to work with you.

1 Does anyone have anything at this point on future status 2 conferences, other than the rather nebulous statement that 3 Angle will be in touch with lead counsel concerning a date? 4 The last thing I want to address before turning 0kay. 5 things over to Judge Stanley are the pro hac vice motions and 6 so forth. Before I do that, let me simply kind of call the 7 roll again of lead counsel and ask them to stand, because those 8 of you who didn't find them in the bar last night may not know 9 all of them. 10 Coordinating co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs: Page 2: 11 Bryan Ayl stock. 12 MR. AYLSTOCK: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N: Henry Garrard. 14 *MR. GARRARD:* Your Honor. 15 CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N: Fred Thompson. 16 *MR. THOMPSON:* Good morning. 17 CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Plaintiffs' Executive Committee 18 includes these three gentlemen, as well as Tom Cartmell, 19 Clayton Clark, Amy Eskin, Derek Potts, Aimee Wagstaff. 20 Co-liaison counsel for the plaintiffs: Harry Bell, Paul Farrell, Carl Frankovitch. 21 22 The lead counsel on each MDL are as follows: Mr. Garrard 23 in the Bard MDL will be joined by Derek Potts, Amy Eskin and 24 Fidelma Fitzpatrick --25 MR. GARRARD: Your Honor, Ms. Fitzpatrick is out of

the country and I don't know whether she notified the Court or 1 2 not, but she's not here. 3 CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: She did not and if she misses 4 the opportunity in the future I'll send her to intensive care. 5 (Laughter.) 6 CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N: Clayton Clark and Aimee 7 Wagstaff will be co-lead counsel in MDL 2326. Renee Baggett 8 and Tom Cartmell will be co-lead counsel for MDL 2327. Barbara Binis of Reed Smith will be lead counsel in MDL 2325. Robert 10 Adams of Shook, Hardy & Bacon will be the lead defense counsel 11 in MDL 2326. 12 Did I leave anybody out? 13 **MAGISTRATE JUDGE STANLEY:** Of course, Mr. Gage. CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Mr. Gage is also with Ethicon's 14 15 MDL. 16 MR. GAGE: Yes, sir. 17 MAGISTRATE JUDGE STANLEY: And Mike Bonasso and Dave 18 Thomas. 19 CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: And Mike Bonasso and Dave 20 Thomas are with which MDL? Boston Scientific? Is that right? 21 That's correct. MR. THOMAS: 22 MR. BONASSO: Yes, Your Honor. And Ethicon. 23 CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N: And Ethicon. All right. Thank 24 you. You can see why I didn't name any more people. 25 The last thing, as I said, I will address before

Judge Stanley are pro hac vice motions and the necessity of local counsel, which is a proposed agenda item. PTO No. 1, paragraph 12, clearly states that attorneys admitted to practice and in good standing in any United States district court are admitted pro hac vice in this litigation and the requirements of Local Rules of Civil Procedure 83.6 are waived. Association of local counsel is not required. Counsel in each newly filed or transferred action will be required - and all of you all are if you haven't done it yet - to complete the ECF Registration Form, the Notice of Attorney Appearance, and Counsel Contact Form. These forms are available on the court's website. Anything further on that matter?

Let me -- since I mentioned the website, I will note that there is a link for every individual MDL on that site. There is what I believe to be a lot of useful information on those sites, including every pretrial order that is entered, contact information for counsel and the court, necessary forms, and notices and information regarding any upcoming court proceedings. I encourage you to review the information on the MDL websites frequently. The question that you attempted to call the Court and ask may very well have been answered by information on the website. If you will please look at that first before calling, I would appreciate it.

We're faced with a unique situation, one that I think

Looking at the fine faces before me will prove to be rewarding,

of having four MDLs -- similar MDLs in this court. In its most simplistic form, we have similar pelvic mesh products manufactured by different defendants that allegedly caused a variety of injuries to women. We suspect and we hope that there are commonalities among the four MDLs, and Judge Stanley and I believe that the most efficient way to handle the four MDLs, particularly for discovery purposes, is to coordinate them as much as possible.

UNI DENTIFIED TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: Good morning.

TELEPHONIC RECORDED MESSAGE: Your call is being recorded.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: All right. Welcome to the call. You're 37 -- 38 minutes late.

I believe that the most efficient way to handle the four MDLs is to consolidate as much as possible. To that end, we need to understand the issues -- we need to understand the issues in a global way and be educated by the parties about what factual and legal issues that the four MDLs have in common. We need to know if there are common witnesses that are likely to be deposed. We need to know if there are common documents. We understand that there will be case specific and/or manufacturer specific discovery that won't be taken care of by this common discovery, but we do anticipate a procedure --

UNI DENTIFIED TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: Apparently the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hearing did start at nine, but for some reason we haven't been hooked in yet, so hopefully they're working on it.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: You are in. Can you hear me?

UNI DENTIFIED FEMALE TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNI DENTIFIED FEMALE TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: We anticipate a procedure whereby the parties engage in common discovery and then revisit the case in manufacturer specific discovery which is to be completed. I would ask for the parties to work together to identify common issues of fact, law, witnesses, documents, et cetera, and to educate the Court about these and work to devise a discovery plan which first implements common discovery and then is followed by manufacturer or case specific di scovery. Our goal - and we are flexible - is to help the parties accomplish discovery in the most economical and efficient way. Both Judge Stanley and I have a number of questions that will help us better understand where commonalities can be found. Judge Stanley will talk about some of those. Some of the questions on her list we have talked about before, but we anticipate that you may identify areas that we've not thought of and we encourage you to do so. Ti I I we understand the full picture, we can't maximize the efficiencies and make this as easy on the parties and clients as we can. We want to arrive at a workable, efficient and logical approach to discovery in these cases. Now, I've never

done this before, but I need to tell you Judge Mary Stanley is one of the best magistrate judges in the United States. She is now long-serving, as witnessed by her gray hair and youthful demeanor, but she is very experienced in dealing with complicated cases and complicated discovery. She only has one flaw, she's going to retire in about a year, which I do not approve of and have tried to dissuade her from doing, but you will find her and her staff to be most helpful. As I'm sure you will learn, she doesn't want to wait until after you've blacked each other's eyes and broken ribs that there's a dispute. If you have a dispute, you will usually be able to get her on the phone and she will resolve the dispute. Unl i ke me, she'll get it right. I'm often in error, but never in doubt. We'll keep -- we'll keep the ball rolling and I think you will enjoy dealing with Judge Stanley.

Let me say this, and this is really fair, and I don't say it to create an in terrorem situation, but you don't want me for a discovery judge.

Judge Stanley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

my remarks perhaps you-all will squeeze together a little bit and let these folks who have been standing up for a while have a seat. Also, you can use these chairs over here against this wall. This is a lesson to all of you, we start hearings on time and you can expect that if a status conference starts at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9:00 it's going to start at 9:00, and you'd better be there in advance, because sometimes it starts early.

Just to give you a little bit of information about myself, I've been on the bench for almost 20 years. Before that I was an assistant United States attorney for 15 years. I tended to enjoy trying and prosecuting complicated cases, the ones that were document heavy and put the jury to sleep, but for some reason it was such a challenge to figure out ways to make it interesting and present the case. I enjoyed that very much.

I have three children, two of whom are lawyers and one of whom -- the other one who is not a lawyer is way more successful, and two granddaughters, and I need granddaughter fixes, so let me just say that in West Virginia family is important. And getting along with each other and helping each other out are important values, and you can start putting that to work right now. And one of the things that I tell lawyers in difficult cases, particularly those where we are going to have periodic status conferences, is that I am very much in favor of scheduling them out well in advance, and I believe that lawyers should share their family issues with each other to the extent that co-lead counsel may want to seriously consider scheduling family vacations for the same weeks. Talk to each other. If all of a sudden somebody's seri ous. sick and has to have surgery, tell each other. This is no time to be macho. This is no time to neglect your family; however,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

37

this case has got to move and the discovery process has to move for the benefit of the clients, the patients, the doctors, the corporations, who are people too, and that means you really are going to have to work together. Judge Goodwin's vacations are going to be honored, my vacations are going to be honored, and so it would be wise for you to honor each other's and to schedule them in such a way that nobody has to cancel.

Now, Judge Goodwin asked about how many of my discovery disputes can be resolved by reading the rules, and the answer is: A lot. I have a friend who used to read to his child at night and the book that he chose to read to his child was the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. It's a guaranteed soporific. If you start with Rule 1, which is probably only as far as he ever got, I'll remind you that the rules are to be construed and administered to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding. Well, we're going to try to do this with all deliberate speed. It is not going to be inexpensive, but we are going to do our very best to make it just. So I have spent time during the past week studying your documents and other materials, such as before the FDA, trying to devise approaches to discovery that will accomplish our purpose without undue burden and expense. And this is a unique and challenging series of cases, so I encourage you to contemplate the big picture portrayed by the plaintiffs' allegations, to be creative, starting now, and to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

propose discovery procedures which are not necessarily focused on your client. Given the underlying theory of the plaintiffs' case that pelvic mesh and its incorporation into the body's tissues is problematic, that seems to me a fair place to start.

I do have a series of questions, and I'm not expecting answers now, but I hope that these questions will start you thi nki ng. So if the issue about pelvic mesh is the beginning point, does it make sense to investigate that theory by category rather than product -- than by product by product or manufacturer by manufacturer? In other words, to develop an overarching discovery of pelvic mesh treatment of stress urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse? I wonder whether we should possibly break that down as to the affected organ, whether it be bladder, uterus, vagina, rectum or combinations of them. I wonder whether the main division should be as between polypropylene mesh versus porcine dermis. We don't know whether there are differences among the coatings We don't know whether there are differences in on the mesh. how the mesh is woven. We don't know whether differences in patients' bodies that can be categorized have an important effect. Such an approach would not focus primarily on the size or shape of the product or the method of implantation, but those may be important considerations. We don't know enough yet. But back in September when the FDA had its hearings, they chose not to focus on a particular project, and I'm

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
wondering -- product, and I'm wondering whether we should.
Now, of course, you lawyers know more about this --
     (Unintelligible telephonic comment.)
          MAGISTRATE JUDGE STANLEY: . . . these facts that I
do, but I hope you'll consider these matters very seriously and
propose some creative approaches, particularly --
          UNI DENTI FI ED MALE TELEPHONI C SPEAKER: Hello.
                                                          Can
you hear this?
          MAGI STRATE JUDGE STANLEY: We can hear you.
     (More unintelligible telephonic comments.)
          MAGI STRATE JUDGE STANLEY:
                                     Mute your phones, please.
     It makes little sense for an expert witness --
          UNI DENTI FI ED FEMALE TELEPHONI C SPEAKER:
                                                    Shoul d
someone else call the port, also?
          TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: This is Regina (unintelligible
comments.) Do you want me to call the Court's -- the judge's
chambers? The gentleman at (unintelligible) acted like it was
the first time he has heard that this call is not being
            He said if we heard the text we should have been
connected.
connected.
                                Well, the judge that's got this
          CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N:
case is speaking to you now --
          TELEPHONIC SPEAKER: -- and we're not.
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: -- and it has been connected,
at least I've heard many of you join the call, and I assume
```

some of you can hear me. Could I maybe hear a "hoorah" from anybody that can hear me?

MAGISTRATE JUDGE STANLEY: Well, if their phones are
muted they won't be speaking up.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Maybe there is a problem with the connection. Well, deregulation of the phone companies has been the bane of my existence.

Since it's not working, turn it off.

And, Judge Stanley, go ahead.

it makes little sense for an expert witness or a Rule 30(b)(6) witness to be subjected to endless and repetitive questions about one product after another which differ only in their size or their shape when those facts may not be material to the issues. We don't know to what extent trade secrets or proprietary information are going to interfere with a unified approach to discovery, but aren't these products patented? Isn't that sufficient protection? Aren't these designs on the public record, perhaps at the FDA?

We have a lot of issues to address and for you-all to educate us. We had an excellent education session in the Bard case and they provided examples of some of their products. I expect the other manufacturers to do the same. We may or may not need a full educational session, but we've looked at the products, we've touched them, we've examined them, and I think

it will be educational for us to be able to compare them one to another.

Please know that in all of the MDLs that Judge Goodwin and I have worked on we keep the case on the top of the stack of virtual files on our desks. We try very hard to assist the parties in achieving agreement as issues arise so that the case moves forward. If that doesn't work, we've got the briefing that we need and we'll issue rulings promptly.

Now, on the website you will see that there are already a lot of agreed orders that have been entered in the Bard MDL. We cannot have conflicting ESI protocols, protective orders, and other similar documents. Please do not spend a lot of time and energy renegotiating such matters. We need to have a unified series of orders. I'm not smart enough to be able to keep them all straight and that will just be unworkable. Similarly, I would expect the plaintiffs' factsheets to be the same in each of the MDLs.

Now, let me mention a couple of matters that have the potential for causing problems. One is the marking of documents as confidential. If a document is available on the public record, it's not confidential, even if your client thinks it is. Do not over mark documents as confidential. Please review the protective order on the court's website and the local rule on sealing documents. We, of course, are dealing with women's most private body areas and it will

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have -- we will be dealing with a lot of private medical records, but you can devise ways of addressing such medical records in ways that they don't have to be sealed from public view, unless, of course, a particular case goes to trial. for example, if you -- just keep these kinds of things in the back of your head and think of them as ways to creatively deal with the problems presented by this case. If, for example, on the five cases that are in the first discovery group, if those people are named as Plaintiff A, B, C and D, or by their initials, then you can take depositions talking about the initials or the letter of the alphabet or whatever without using the person's name, and that means the deposition doesn't have to be sealed. These MDLs are of national importance and the public has a right to understand and know about these products. And the judges of this district have made it very clear that they are resistant to sealing documents from the public record.

I'm looking forward to getting to know those of you who I don't know already and in assisting you in achieving justice in these MDLs. Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Thank you, Judge Stanley.

Echoing one part of her remarks, we don't shove MDLs aside and treat them as second-class cases only to be picked up occasionally and looked at. The fact that there are hundreds of similar cases doesn't mean that each case isn't considered

by us as an important matter. I offer as evidence of

Judge Stanley's statement that we keep it on top of the virtual

file -- or stack on our desk the fact that we have closed, or

shortly will close, three MDLs. You can look through the other

MDLs around the country and see how many judges have closed

three MDLs within a reasonable span of time.

It will be the case that individual lawyers with a lot of cases will need the attentions of lead counsel and the steering committee members. Based on what information I had before I made these appointments, I'm confident that I've done a good job in selecting lead counsel. I am confident they will be responsive to you, but I do invite you that if you have a complaint about lead counsel not being responsive, let me know. And it's a matter we will discuss at our meetings, which will be frequent.

I don't know what time the first flight is out of
Charleston, but that might determine how long this next part
goes. Any other matters counsel want to discuss at this time?

(Laughter.)

CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Mr. Garrard?

MR. GARRARD: Your Honor, I do have one clarification question. When the defendants presented their position papers they listed pending motions, and my interpretation of the rules is that that starts dates running for responses and action on those motions and I would ask of the Court if in fact that's a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

```
correct interpretation, and if it is, may we have some
direction from the Court that changes that and delays that
timing as we get this organization going?
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Is there objection?
          MR. GAGE: No objection, Your Honor.
          CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N:
                                Work it out.
          MR. GAGE:
                    We will do that.
          UNI DENTI FI ED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.
          MR. GARRARD: Thank you.
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Anything else?
          MS. BINIS:
                     Your Honor.
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Yes, ma'am.
          MS. BINIS:
                      Barbara Binis for AMS.
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: Yes, ma'am.
          MS. BINIS: How are you, Your Honor? Just a point of
clarification, Your Honor. You had said earlier that AMS was
consolidated in New Jersey under Judge Higbee. In fact, we
are in two or three cases there, but we are consolidated in
Delaware before Judge Mary Johnson --
          CHIEF JUDGE GOODWIN: I stand corrected.
          MS. BINIS: -- and in Minnesota before Judge Ronald
Abrams, just so you know that.
          CHI EF JUDGE GOODWI N:
                               Thank you.
                                            Keeping track of
the state cases is going to require each of you, and not just
lead counsel, but each of you through your liaison counsel to
```

let me know what's going on in the state cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I didn't, you know, just get off the pickle boat. been doing this business of practicing law for a while, so I know there are advantages to having two bites at the apple, one in federal court, one in state court, and maybe three bites in another state court. I'm going to try to cut down the amount of apple munching, insofar as I can without impinging upon anybody's fundamental interests in a case. All of the clients deserve a reasonably speedy resolution. Defendants, plaintiffs, each deserve a reasonably speedy resolution. The size of the litigation and the number of courts that these kind of cases are in should not slow things down. In fact, it's supposed to be -- you're supposed to get some kind of economies at scale here and I'm hoping we can do that, because that's in the best interests of each of your clients.

appointed. I look forward and encourage each lawyer to stay up to date with this litigation. Just because you're not on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, or you're not on the Lead Counsel Executive Committee, or whatever all the other names were that I said, doesn't mean that you don't have an obligation to stay abreast of the case at all times. You can get in dutch, you can get malpractice -- I didn't -- I hate to say that word. You can get malpractice claims filed against you in these cases, because the individual lawyer remains

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I can tell you, just so you know in advance, responsi bl e. that once you bring a case it is not easy in my court to get out of it. If your client doesn't have another lawyer, you're going to find it difficult with hearings and so forth to get out, so be careful what cases you bring. Welcome to Charleston, and I hope you come back often. I'll look forward to seeing many of you in the future. questions should go through the structure. Let me make a recommendation that you stay here for a few moments and talk to the people I've appointed and let them address whatever We won't get all of you together again. matters. That's not going to likely happen. I hope each of you got the 20 percent discount on motels that I arranged. (Laughter.) Again, thank you very much. Court is adjourned. (Proceeding adjourned at 10:02 a.m., April 13, 2012.) CERTI FI CATI ON: I, Teresa L. Harvey, Registered Diplomate Reporter, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the matters of In re American Medical Systems, Inc., MDL No. 2325; In re Boston Scientific Corp., MDL No. 2326; and in re Ethicon, Inc., MDL No. 2327, as reported on April 13, 2012. <u>s/Teresa L. Harvey, RDR, CRR</u> April 23, 2012